

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application based on the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Claims 13-24 remain pending.

Claim 18 is amended as per the Examiner's suggestion.

The objection to claim 19 is not understood. The expression "the area of markings is the same in each nominal area" is not considered indefinite or ambiguous and conforms to the language in the specification on page 3, lines 18-20. Nevertheless, for additional clarity, claim 19 is amended to recite that the markings coverage in each nominal area is the same. Accordingly, reconsideration of the objection to claim 19 is requested.

Claims 13 and 14 are considered to be anticipated under 35 USC 102(b) in view of WO 92/05535.

Applicants respectfully disagree and request reconsideration of this rejection.

As readily visible from the drawing figure of WO 92/05535, a conventional dot matrix pattern is illustrated. In particular, the "markings" are distributed in a series of regular diagonal lines each uniformly spaced from adjacent lines. This is also consistent with the disclosure on page 4, lines 18-19, which merely refers to the "density" of the dot matrix increasing in the direction away from the light source.

There is no disclosure or suggestion of a **random** disposition of the markings.

Accordingly, since an element in each of claims 13 and 14 is not found in the prior art, this rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Similarly, the rejection of claims 15-24 under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentably obvious over WO 92/05535 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Nothing in the disclosure (including the drawing) of WO 92/05535 refers to anything other than an ordinary dot matrix pattern of markings. A random pattern of marking is not an obvious variation of the structure illustrated and described in the prior art. Effects of the random distribution may be appreciated from Figure 3 (random) and Figure 4 (uniform) of the present application.

It is further noted, for example, that other features of the claims are also not suggested in the reference. For example, the reference suggests only substantially complete coverage of only a single nominal area (the entire surface).

Accordingly, the rejection of claims 15-24 should also be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, the claims are now believed to be in form for allowance, and such action is hereby solicited. If any point remains in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Attached is a marked-up version of the changes made to the specification and claims by the current amendment. The attached Appendix is captioned **"Version with markings to show changes made"**.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP

By: Richard A. Steinberg

Richard A. Steinberg

Registration No. 26,588

Direct No. (703) 905-2039

Paul L. Sharer

Registration No. 36,004

Direct No. (703) 905-2180

1600 Tysons Boulevard  
McLean, VA 22102  
(703) 905-2000 Telephone  
(703) 905-2500 Facsimile

Enclosure: Appendix

**APPENDIX: VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE**

**IN THE CLAIMS:**

18. (Amended) An edge-lit illumination system as claimed in claim 13, wherein each nominal area is of a different [area] **size**.

19. (Amended) An edge-lit illumination system as claimed in claim 13, wherein the [area of] markings coverage [is the same] in each nominal area **is the same**.

*End of Appendix*